

REMARKS

Claim 12 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13 and 16 have been amended. Claims 17-20 have been added. Claims 1-11 and 13-20 remain for further consideration. No new matter has been added.

The objections and rejections shall be taken up in the order presented in the Office Action.

1. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9 and 11 have been objected to due to various alleged informalities. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 11 have obviated the objections.

2. The specification has been objected to for allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. It is respectfully submitted that the amendment to the specification has obviated the objection.

3-4. Claims 1-4 and 6-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter disclosed in U.S. Patent 6,351,435 (Kronenberg et al.) and Applicants' disclosure on page 2 of the specification (the Prior Art).

As amended, claim 1 recites a radio controllable clock that comprises:

“a plurality of rotary gears each uniquely associated with one of said clock hand shafts, for rotating said clock hand shafts, each rotary gear having a face, wherein each of said rotary gears includes a protrusion extending substantially perpendicular from said face;

...

a reset claw operably positioned to engage at least one of said protrusions to stop the rotation of said clock hand shaft associated with said protrusion to

position said clock hand associated with said protrusion at a datum position.” [cl. 1, emphasis added]

The reset claw is operably positioned to engage at least one of said protrusions extending substantially perpendicularly from the face.

Kronenberg neither discloses nor suggests a protrusion extending substantially perpendicularly from the face. Kronenberg discloses a timepiece having an analog display having a shaped body F with a gear wheel Z1 formed in the bottom region thereof (col. 2, lines 64 - col. 3, lines 20 and FIG. 1). As the shaped body F rotates in a counterclockwise manner, a locking bar R engages a stop A preventing further counterclockwise rotation of the shaped body F (col. 3, lines 14-20). Clockwise rotation of the shaped body is not prevented by the locking bar R (col. 3, lines 7-8). Thus, the reference position of the hand Z, which is required to automatically reset the timepiece, must be achieved through the counterclockwise rotation of the shaped body F.

Claim 1 recites that the protrusion extends substantially *perpendicularly* from the face, which is substantially perpendicular to the common axis. In contrast, the stop A of Kronenberg extends along a plane that is *parallel* to the surface of the shaped body F (see FIG. 1 of Kronenberg). Kronenberg neither discloses nor suggests positioning the protrusion to extend substantially *perpendicularly* from the face as recited in claim 1. In addition, modifying the system disclosed in Kronenberg such that the stop extends perpendicularly from the face of the shaped body F would render the device of Kronenberg inoperable, since the locking bar R would fail to engage the stop A while rotating in a counterclockwise manner and thus no reference position could ever be established. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Kronenberg fails to suggest at least the feature of Applicants' claimed invention relating to the protrusion and that claim 1, and claims 2-11 dependent thereon, are now patentable in view thereof.

It is alleged that claim 12 fails to recite a positive limitation. In view of the cancellation to claim 12, the objection is now moot.

Claims 13 and 20 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

5-6. Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly obvious in view of U.S. Patent 6,351,435 (Kronenberg et al.), the Prior Art and U.S. Patent 5,479,379 (Tsuchiya).

Claim 5 is dependent on claims 1 and 2 which the Applicants believe are patentable and thus the dependent claims are also patentable.

8. The undersigned notes the additional prior art of record and agrees with the Examiner that this additional prior art neither anticipates nor renders obvious the claimed invention.

For all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-11 and 13-20 is respectfully requested.

If a telephone interview could assist in the prosecution of this application, please call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard L. Stevens, Jr.
Registration No. 44,357
Samuels, Gauthier & Stevens, LLP
225 Franklin Street, Suite 3300
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
Telephone: (617) 426-9180
Extension 123